

REMARKS

This is a full and timely response to the outstanding non-final Office Action mailed September 10, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims are respectfully requested.

1. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102 (e)

Claims 1, 3-5, and 7-25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by *Hicks* (U.S. Patent No. 7,086,001). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

It is axiomatic that "[a]nticipation requires the disclosure in a single prior art reference of each element of the claim under consideration." *W. L. Gore & Associates, Inc. v. Garlock, Inc.*, 721 F.2d 1540, 1554, 220 USPQ 303, 313 (Fed. Cir. 1983). Therefore, every claimed feature of the claimed invention must be represented in the applicable reference to constitute a proper rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e).

In the present case, not every feature of the claimed invention is represented in the *Hicks* reference. Applicants discuss the *Hicks* reference and Applicants' claims in the following.

a. Claim 1

As provided in independent claim 1, Applicants claim:

A method comprising:
receiving a user selection of one or more non-printer-specific print options via a network service;
storing the user selection of the one or more non-printer-specific print options in a user profile store;
wherein the one or more non-printer-specific print options are identified for subsequent resolution, and
wherein the one or more non-printer-specific print options can be applied to a plurality of other network services, the non-printer-specific print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print non-printer-specific options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more non-printer-specific options are used in printing a document and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in

accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 1 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hicks* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "receiving a user selection of one or more non-printer-specific print options via a network service; storing the user selection of the one or more non-printer-specific print options in a user profile store . . . wherein the one or more non-printer-specific print options can be applied to a plurality of other network services, the non-printer-specific print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print non-printer-specific options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more non-printer-specific options are used in printing a document and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as emphasized above.

Rather, *Hicks* describes a document delivery system where a job ticket may contain a collection of specific information concerning desired output presentation. "In the case, where print driver 17 is used, here when the user selects 'auto' as the print designation, job ticket information is provided by the client print driver 17. In this case print driver 17 includes a generic language translator 24 which translates an electronic document into a non-specific, or printer independent, printer language file and appends to this file a job ticket containing other rendering characteristics which may not be supported by the printer independent language." Col. 4, lines 21-42. The job is then routed to a device which is considered to be appropriate for handling the job. Col. 4, lines 57-61.

Regarding the job ticket, *Hicks* discloses that the "job ticket is designed to allow routing of the job to the best device and storing of data for billing and management purposes. The job ticket allows separation of the job specific features, such as number of copies, finishing, recipient information, etc., from the image data." Col. 5, lines 52-54 (Emphasis added). Accordingly, the job ticket is specific to a particular job.

As such, *Hicks* fails to teach or suggest the storing of user selection of one or more non-printer specific print options in a user profile store. Rather, *Hicks* discloses a job ticket which contains job specific features for a particular job and not user profile information. Accordingly, the job ticket is not applied to other network services. As stated above, the job ticket is applied to a singular job. Therefore, *Hicks* does not teach or suggest "receiving a user selection of one or more non-printer-specific print options via a network service; storing the user selection of the one or more non-printer-specific print options in a user profile store . . . where the one or more non-printer-specific options are used in printing a document and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request . . . wherein the one or more non-printer-specific print options can be applied to a plurality of other network services, the non-printer-specific print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print non-printer-specific options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more non-printer-specific options are used in printing a document and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as recited in claim 1.

For at least these reasons, claim 1 is not anticipated by *Hicks*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

b. Claims 3-4

Claim 1 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 3-4 depend from claim 1 and recite additional features, claims 3-4 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

c. Claim 5

As provided in independent claim 5, Applicants claim:

One or more computer readable media encoded with a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

communicating a plurality of possible print options to a client computer;

receiving a user indication of selected ones of the plurality of possible print options;

receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the selected print options;

saving the selected print options with the associated identifier; and

making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document, wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 5 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hicks* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the selected print options; saving the selected print options with the associated identifier; and making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document, wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request,” as emphasized above.

Rather, *Hicks* describes a document delivery system where a job ticket may contain a collection of specific information concerning desired output presentation. “In the case, where print driver 17 is used, here when the user selects ‘auto’ as the print designation, job ticket information is provided by the client print driver 17. In this case print driver 17 includes a generic language translator 24 which translates an electronic

document into a non-specific, or printer independent, printer language file and appends to this file a job ticket containing other rendering characteristics which may not be supported by the printer independent language." Col. 4, lines 21-42. The job is then routed to a device which is considered to be appropriate for handling the job. Col. 4, lines 57-61.

Regarding the job ticket, *Hicks* discloses that the "job ticket is designed to allow routing of the job to the best device and storing of data for billing and management purposes. The job ticket allows separation of the job specific features, such as number of copies, finishing, recipient information, etc., from the image data." Col. 5, lines 52-54 (Emphasis added). Accordingly, the job ticket is specific to a particular job.

As such, *Hicks* fails to teach or suggest the saving of user indication of one or more selected print options. Rather, *Hicks* discloses a job ticket which contains job specific features and not user information associated with an identifier. As stated above, the job ticket is applied to a singular job. Therefore, *Hicks* does not teach or suggest "receiving an identifier, indicated by the user, associated with the selected print options; saving the selected print options with the associated identifier; and making the selected print options subsequently available to the user for configuring of a plurality of printers in a particular manner, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more options are used in printing a document, wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as recited in claim 5. (Emphasis added). For example, *Hicks* does not disclose that a job ticket is subsequently available to a user. Rather, *Hicks* describes that a job ticket is used once and after the job is completed, it is not used for another job.

For at least these reasons, claim 5 is not anticipated by *Hicks*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

d. Claim 7-8

Claim 5 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 7-8 depend from claim 5 and recite additional features, claims 7-8 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

e. Claim 9

As provided in independent claim 9, Applicants claim:

A graphical user interface comprising:
a plurality of portions illustrating user-selectable non-printer-specific print options and graphical mechanisms via which a user can select the print options;

an additional user-input mechanism via which the user can input an identifier of the selected non-printer-specific print options; and

another graphical mechanism via which the user can indicate a desire to save the selected non-printer-specific print options as associated with the identifier and for subsequent provision to a plurality of printers, the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more non-printer-specific print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more non-printer-specific print options are used in printing a document and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 9 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hicks* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “an additional user-input mechanism via which the user can input an identifier of the selected non-printer-specific print options; and another graphical mechanism via which the user can indicate a desire to save the selected non-printer-specific print options as associated with the identifier and for subsequent provision to a plurality of printers, the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more non-printer-specific print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more non-printer-specific

print options are used in printing a document and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as emphasized above.

Rather, *Hicks* describes a document delivery system where a job ticket may contain a collection of specific information concerning desired output presentation. "In the case, where print driver 17 is used, here when the user selects 'auto' as the print designation, job ticket information is provided by the client print driver 17. In this case print driver 17 includes a generic language translator 24 which translates an electronic document into a non-specific, or printer independent, printer language file and appends to this file a job ticket containing other rendering characteristics which may not be supported by the printer independent language." Col. 4, lines 21-42. The job is then routed to a device which is considered to be appropriate for handling the job. Col. 4, lines 57-61.

Regarding the job ticket, *Hicks* discloses that the "job ticket is designed to allow routing of the job to the best device and storing of data for billing and management purposes. The job ticket allows separation of the job specific features, such as number of copies, finishing, recipient information, etc., from the image data." Col. 5, lines 52-54 (Emphasis added). Accordingly, the job ticket is specific to a particular job.

As such, *Hicks* fails to teach or suggest the saving of user indication of one or more selected print options. Rather, *Hicks* discloses a job ticket which contains job specific features and not user information associated with an identifier. As stated above, the job ticket is applied to a singular job. Therefore, *Hicks* does not teach or suggest "an additional user-input mechanism via which the user can input an identifier of the selected non-printer-specific print options; and another graphical mechanism via which the user can indicate a desire to save the selected non-printer-specific print options as associated with the identifier and for subsequent provision to a plurality of printers, the print options serving to configure a printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more non-printer-specific print options submitted with a print request to a respective one of the plurality of printers where the one or more non-printer-specific print options are used in printing a

document and the respective one of the plurality of printers applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as recited in claim 9.

For at least these reasons, claim 9 is not anticipated by *Hicks*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

f. Claims 10-14

Claim 9 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 10-14 depend from claim 9 and recite additional features, claims 10-14 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

g. Claim 15

As provided in independent claim 15, Applicants claim:

One or more computer readable media having stored thereon a plurality of instructions that, when executed by one or more processors, causes the one or more processors to perform acts including:

receiving an indication of one of a plurality of sets of non-printer-specific print options to be used in printing a document irrespective of a printer on which the document is to be printed, the non-printer-specific print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more non-printer-specific print options submitted with a print request to a printer where the one or more non-printer-specific print options are used in printing the document;

receiving an indication of one of a plurality of printers on which the document is to be printed; and

communicating the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the non-printer-specific print options identified in the set of non-printer-specific print options, wherein the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 15 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hicks* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least "communicating the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the non-printer-specific print options

identified in the set of non-printer-specific print options, wherein the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as recited and emphasized above in claim 15.

Rather, *Hicks* describes a document delivery system where a job ticket may contain a collection of specific information concerning desired output presentation. "In the case, where print driver 17 is used, here when the user selects 'auto' as the print designation, job ticket information is provided by the client print driver 17. In this case print driver 17 includes a generic language translator 24 which translates an electronic document into a non-specific, or printer independent, printer language file and appends to this file a job ticket containing other rendering characteristics which may not be supported by the printer independent language." Col. 4, lines 21-42. The job is then routed to a device which is considered to be appropriate for handling the job. Col. 4, lines 57-61. *Hicks* states that "[d]evices have a subset of attributes that define the types of tasks that can be processed. If a task requests a function that is outside the set defined by the device's attributes, then the device is considered to be incapable of processing the task." Col. 7, lines 29-32 (Emphasis added). Accordingly, *Hicks* fails to teach or suggest at least "communicating the indicated set of non-printer-specific print options to the indicated printer irrespective of whether the printer supports one or more of the non-printer-specific print options identified in the set of non-printer-specific print options, wherein the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request," as recited in claim 15. (Emphasis added).

For at least these reasons, claim 15 is not anticipated by *Hicks*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

h. Claims 16-18

Claim 15 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 16-18 depend from claim 15 and recite additional features, claims 16-18 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

i. Claim 19

As provided in independent claim 19, Applicants claim:

A system comprising:

a network interface configured to allow the system to communicate with one or more other systems via a network; and

a printer configuration user interface, communicatively coupled to the network interface and, wherein the printer configuration user interface is configured to allow a user of a client interface to select print options and group the selection together as a configuration associated with a particular name, and wherein the printer configuration user interface is further configured to allow the user to select print options without regard for print options supported by a printer that the user can subsequently print to, the print options serving to configure the printer in a particular manner for printing, the particular manner defined by the one or more print options submitted with a print request to the printer where the one or more options are used in printing the document and ***to direct transmission of the configuration to a remote storage location for subsequent retrieval by this printer configuration user interface or another printer configuration user interface***, wherein each of the plurality of print options is not specific to a particular printer and the printer applies requested print options that the printer supports in accordance with the non-printer-specific print options that are identified in the print request.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 19 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hicks* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “to direct transmission of the configuration to a remote storage location for subsequent retrieval by this printer configuration user interface or another printer configuration user interface,” as emphasized above.

Rather, *Hicks* describes a document delivery system where a job ticket may contain a collection of specific information concerning desired output presentation. “In the case, where print driver 17 is used, here when the user selects ‘auto’ as the print designation, job ticket information is provided by the client print driver 17. In this case print driver 17 includes a generic language translator 24 which translates an electronic document into a non-specific, or printer independent, printer language file and appends to this file a job ticket containing other rendering characteristics which may not be

supported by the printer independent language.” Col. 4, lines 21-42. The job is then routed to a device which is considered to be appropriate for handling the job. Col. 4, lines 57-61.

Regarding the job ticket, *Hicks* discloses that the “job ticket is designed to allow routing of the job to the best device and storing of data for billing and management purposes. The job ticket allows separation of the job specific features, such as number of copies, finishing, recipient information, etc., from the image data.” Col. 5, lines 52-54 (Emphasis added). Accordingly, the job ticket is specific to a particular job.

As such, *Hicks* fails to teach or suggest the storing of user selection of print options at a remote storage location for subsequent retrieval by a printer configuration user interface. Rather, *Hicks* discloses a job ticket which contains job specific features and not user selection of print options for subsequent retrieval by a user. As stated above, the job ticket is applied to a singular job. Therefore, *Hicks* does not teach or suggest “to direct transmission of the configuration to a remote storage location for subsequent retrieval by this printer configuration user interface or another printer configuration user interface,” as recited in claim 19.

For at least these reasons, claim 19 is not anticipated by *Hicks*, and the rejection should be withdrawn.

j. Claims 20-21

Claim 19 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 20-21 depend from claim 19 and recite additional features, claims 20-21 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

k. Claim 22

As provided in independent claim 22, Applicants claim:

A method, implemented in a print service coupled to a network, the method comprising:

receiving, from a device in the network, a print request identifying both a document to be printed and a set of desired non-printer-specific print options, wherein the set of desired non-printer-specific print options includes a corresponding setting for one or more of the desired non-printer-specific print options;

checking whether a printer corresponding to the print service supports the desired non-printer-specific print options; and for each option in the set of desired non-printer-specific print options,

applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the non-printer-specific print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the non-printer-specific print option.

(Emphasis added).

Applicants respectfully submit that independent claim 22 is allowable for at least the reason that *Hicks* does not disclose, teach, or suggest at least “applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the non-printer-specific print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the non-printer-specific print option,” as recited and emphasized above in claim 22.

Rather, *Hicks* describes a document delivery system where a job ticket may contain a collection of specific information concerning desired output presentation. “In the case, where print driver 17 is used, here when the user selects ‘auto’ as the print designation, job ticket information is provided by the client print driver 17. In this case print driver 17 includes a generic language translator 24 which translates an electronic document into a non-specific, or printer independent, printer language file and appends to this file a job ticket containing other rendering characteristics which may not be supported by the printer independent language.” Col. 4, lines 21-42. The job is then routed to a device which is considered to be appropriate for handling the job. Col. 4, lines 57-61. *Hicks* states that “[d]evices have a subset of attributes that define the types of tasks that can be processed. If a task requests a function that is outside the set defined by the device’s attributes, then the device is considered to be incapable of processing the task.” Col. 7, lines 29-32 (Emphasis added). Accordingly, *Hicks* fails to teach or suggest at least “applying the setting corresponding to the option if the printer supports the non-printer-specific print option, and ignoring the setting corresponding to the option if the printer does not support the non-printer-specific print option.” as recited in claim 22. (Emphasis added).

Therefore, claim 22 is not anticipated by *Hicks*, and the rejection should be withdrawn for at least these reasons.

I. Claims 23-25

Claim 22 is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reasons given above. Since claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and recite additional features, claims 23-25 are allowable as a matter of law over the cited art of record.

2. Response to Rejection of Claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 2 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hicks* in view of *Yanagidaira* (U.S. Patent No. 6,490,052). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Claim 2 is allowable is allowable over the cited art of record for at least the reason that claim 2 contains all the features on independent claim 1 and *Yanagidaira* does not remedy the deficiencies of the *Hicks* reference.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that all objections and/or rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned agent at (770) 933-9500.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles W. Griggers
Reg. No. 47,283